



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MR. SPENCER ON THE ETHICS OF KANT.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER published in the *Fortnightly Review* for July 1888 and in the *Popular Science Monthly* for August of the same year an article on "The Ethics of Kant" in which he so strangely misrepresents Kant's position that Kant to any uninitiated reader must appear not only as superficial and shallow, but even as palpably nonsensical.

Mr. Spencer's article on "The Ethics of Kant" is a severe criticism mainly of the nonsensical idea, erroneously imputed to Kant, of a will that has no end. At the same time Mr. Spencer reproaches Kant with assuming the simplicity of conscience and believing in a non-evolutionary origin of the minds of living beings.

In reply to Mr. Spencer an editorial article appeared in *The Open Court* under the caption "Herbert Spencer on the Ethics of Kant" (Nos. 51 and 52), which was supplemented by another article entitled "Kant on Evolution" (No. 158), the latter being elicited by a renewed attack of Mr. Spencer upon Kant's views (which appeared in *Mind*, No. LIX, p. 313).

Mr. Spencer has republished his article "The Ethics of Kant" together with many other older articles in a work of three volumes entitled "Essays Scientific, Political, and Speculative," 1891, in which he repeats the following sentence :

"Thus the basis of the argument by which Kant attempts to justify his assumption that there exists a good will apart from a good end, disappears utterly ; and leaves his dogma in all its naked unthinkableness."

To this sentence he adds the following foot-note as a reply to my criticisms :

"I find that in the above three paragraphs I have done Kant less than justice and more than justice—less, in assuming that his evolutionary view was limited to the genesis of our sidereal system, and more, in assuming that he had not contradicted himself. My knowledge of Kant's writings is extremely limited. In 1844 a translation of his 'Critique of Pure Reason' (then I think lately published) fell into my hands, and I read the first few pages enunciating his doctrine of Time and Space : my peremptory rejection of which caused me to lay the book down. Twice since then the same thing has happened ; for, being an impatient reader, when I disagree with the cardinal propositions of a work I can go no further. One other thing I knew. By indirect references I was made aware that Kant had propounded the idea that celestial bodies have been formed by the aggregation of diffused matter. Beyond this my knowledge of his conceptions did not extend ; and my supposition that his evolutionary conception had stopped short with the genesis of sun, stars, and planets, was due to the fact that his doctrine of Time and Space, as forms of thought anteceding experience, implied a supernatural origin inconsistent with the hypothesis of natural genesis. Dr. Paul Carus, who, shortly after the publication of this article in the *Fortnightly Review* for July, 1888, undertook to defend the Kantian ethics in the American journal which he edits, *The Open Court*, has now (Sept. 4, 1890), in another defensive article, translated sundry passages from Kant's 'Critique of Judgment,' his 'Presumable Origin of Humanity,' and his work 'Upon the different Races of Mankind,' showing that Kant was, if not fully, yet partially, an evolutionist in his speculations about living beings. There is, perhaps, some reason for doubting the correctness of Dr. Carus's rendering of these passages into English. When, as in the first of the articles just named, he failed to distinguish between consciousness and conscientiousness, and when, as in this last article, he blames the English for mistranslating Kant, since they have said 'Kant maintained that Space and Time are intuitions,' which is quite untrue, for they have everywhere described him as maintaining that Space and Time are *forms* of intuition, one may be excused for thinking that possibly Dr. Carus has read into some of Kant's expressions, meanings which they do not rightly bear. Still, the general drift of the passages quoted makes it tolerably clear that Kant must have believed in the operation of natural causes as largely, though not entirely, instrumental in producing organic forms : extending this belief (which he says 'can be named a daring venture of reason') in some measure to the origin of Man himself. He does not, however extend the theory of natural genesis to the exclusion of the theory of supernatural genesis. When he speaks of an organic habit 'which in the wisdom of nature appears to be thus arranged in order that the species shall be preserved'; and when, further, he says 'we see, moreover, that a germ of reason is placed in him, whereby, after the development of the same, he is destined for social intercourse,' he implies divine intervention. And this shows that I was justified in ascribing to him the belief that Space and Time, as forms of thought, are supernatural endowments. Had he conceived of organic evolution in a consistent manner,

he would necessarily have regarded Space and Time as subjective forms generated by converse with objective realities.

"Beyond showing that Kant had a partial, if not a complete, belief in organic evolution (though with no idea of its causes), the passages translated by Dr. Carus show that he entertained an implied belief which it here specially concerns me to notice as bearing on his theory of 'a good will.' He quotes approvingly Dr. Moscati's lecture showing 'that the upright walk of man is constrained and unnatural, and showing the imperfect visceral arrangements and consequent diseases which result: not only adopting, but further illustrating, Dr. Moscati's argument. If here, then, there is a distinct admission, or rather assertion, that various human organs are imperfectly adjusted to their functions, what becomes of the postulate above quoted 'that no organ for any purpose will be found in it but what is also the fittest and best adapted for that purpose'? And what becomes of the argument which sets out with this postulate? Clearly, I am indebted to Dr. Carus for enabling me to prove that Kant's defence of his theory of 'a good will' is, by his own showing, baseless."

Mr. Spencer's reply to my criticisms is surprising in more than one respect.

First, without even mentioning the objections I make he discredits my arguments by throwing doubt upon the correctness of the translations of the quoted passages.

Secondly, he alleges, with a view of justifying his doubt, that in the first of my articles I "failed to distinguish between consciousness and conscientiousness." \*

Thirdly, Mr. Spencer declares that I had "read into some of Kant's expressions, meanings which they do not rightly bear."

Fourthly, Mr. Spencer bases this opinion upon a double mistake: he blames me for not distinguishing between the Kantian phrases that "Space and Time are intuitions" and that they are "forms of intuition."

Fifthly, acknowledging after all that Kant had at least "a partial belief in organic evolution," Mr. Spencer accuses him of inconsistency.

---

\* This article "Herbert Spencer on the Ethics of Kant" was electrotyped at the time it appeared in *The Open Court*. It is appended to this number of *The Monist* as documentary evidence of the fact, that there is not even so much as an occasion in the article for confounding "consciousness" and "conscientiousness."

Sixthly, several statements concerning Kant's views are made not because Kant held them but because Mr. Spencer assumes for trivial reasons that he is "justified in ascribing them to him."

Seventhly, these statements so vigorously set forth are accompanied by Mr. Spencer's remarkably frank confession of unfamiliarity with the subject under discussion.

It may be added that Mr. Spencer calls my criticisms "defensive articles." He says that "I undertook to defend the Kantian ethics"; while, in fact, my articles are aggressive. Kant needs no defense for being misunderstood, and it would not be my business to defend him, for I am not a Kantian in the sense that I adopt any of the main doctrines of Kant. On the contrary I dissent from him on almost all fundamental questions. In ethics I object to Kant's views in so far as they can be considered as pure formalism.\* I am a Kantian only in the sense that I respect Kant as one of the most eminent philosophers, that I revere him as that teacher of mine whose influence upon me was greatest, and I consider the study of Kant's works as an indispensable requisite for understanding the problems of the philosophy of our time. Far from defending Kant's position, I only undertook to inform Mr. Spencer of what Kant had really maintained, so that instead of denouncing absurdities which Kant had never thought of, he might criticise the real Kant.

\* \* \*

I shall now take up the details of Mr. Spencer's reply:

#### I.

I am sorry to see that Mr. Spencer, instead of frankly acknowledging his errors, has taken refuge in discrediting the translations, which might very easily have been examined either by himself or by friends of his; especially as the German original of the most important passages, wherever any doubt might arise, and also of those expressions on the misconception of which Mr. Spencer bases his unfavorable opinion of Kant, were added in foot-notes.

---

\* See *Fundamental Problems*, pp. 197-206; and *The Ethical Problem*, p. 32, seq., especially p. 33, lines 18-20.

## II.

But Mr. Spencer adduces, as if it were a fact, an instance of my grave mistakes. He says that I failed to distinguish between "consciousness" and "conscientiousness." Mr. Spencer makes much of a small matter, which, if it were as he assumes, would have to be considered as a misprint.

Mr. Spencer's statement is so positive that it must make on any reader the impression of being indubitably true. However, in the whole first article of mine, and indeed in both articles, "conscientiousness" is nowhere mentioned and it would be wrong to replace the word "consciousness" in any of the passages in which it occurs by "conscientiousness."

I should be glad if Mr. Spencer would kindly point out to me the passage which he had in mind when making his statement, for since there is not even so much as an occasion for confounding consciousness and conscientiousness, I stand here before a psychological problem. Mr. Spencer's statement is a perfect riddle to me. Either I have a negative hallucination, as psychologists call it, so that I do not see what is really there, or Mr. Spencer must have had a positive hallucination. That which Mr. Spencer has read into my article, was never written and it is not there. The alleged fact to which he refers, does not exist.

This kind of erroneous reference into which Mr. Spencer has inadvertently fallen is a very grievous mistake. It appears more serious than a simple slip of the pen, when we consider that Mr. Spencer uses the statement for the purpose of incrimination. He justifies upon this exceedingly slender basis his doubt concerning the correctness of the translations of the quoted passages, and Mr. Spencer's doubt concerning the correctness of these translations is his main argument for rejecting my criticisms *in toto*.

It is not impossible, indeed it is probable, that Mr. Spencer meant "conscience" instead of "conscientiousness." There is one passage in which a superficial reader might have expected "conscience" in place of consciousness." However that does not occur in any of the translations, but in a paragraph where I speak on my

own account. This passage appears in the appended reprint on page 23, line 14. Whatever anybody might have expected in that passage, I certainly intended to say "consciousness," and only a hasty reader, only he who might merely read the first line of the paragraph, would consider the word "consciousness" a mistake.

To avoid any equivocation, however, even to hasty readers, and to guard against a misconstruction such as Mr. Spencer possibly has given to the sentence, I propose to alter the passage by adding a few words as follows :

"It is quite true that *not only conscience, but every state of consciousness is a feeling,*" etc.

The italicised words are inserted, simply to show that here I mean "consciousness," and *not* "conscience." For the rest, they do not alter in the least the sense of the sentence. In this passage as throughout the whole article the terms "consciousness," and "conscience" have been used properly.

\* \* \*

Observing that Mr. Spencer appears to have committed the same mistake for which he erroneously blames me, I do not mean to say that he "failed to distinguish between" conscientiousness and conscience. I should rather regard it as trifling on my part if I drew this inference from what is either a slip of the pen or an oversight in proof-reading. But it strikes me that that knavish rogue among the fairies whom Shakespeare calls Puck and scientists define as chance or coincidence played in a fit of anger and perhaps from a sentiment of pardonable irony a humorous trick upon Mr. Spencer. The moral of it is that when an author censures his fellow authors with undue severity for things that might be mere misprints, he should keep a close eye on his own printer's devil.

### III.

Mr. Spencer discredits my knowledge of Kant. He says of me :

"One may be excused for thinking that possibly Dr. Carus has read into some of Kant's expressions, meanings which they do not rightly bear."

I did not give Mr. Spencer any occasion for making this personal reflection. I do not boast of any extraordinary familiarity

with Kant's writings. There are innumerable German and also English and American scholars and philosophers who know Kant almost by heart. But the question at issue is not what I conceive Kant's ideas to be, but what Kant has really said, and I was very careful in letting Kant speak for himself.

My criticism of Mr. Spencer's conception of Kant consisted almost exclusively in collating and contrasting Mr. Spencer's views of Kant with quotations from Kant's works. How can I read anything into some of Kant's expressions, if I present translations of the expressions themselves, adding thereto in foot-notes the original whenever doubts could arise? And the general drift of the quotations alone suffices to overthrow Mr. Spencer's conception of Kant.

The truth is that Mr. Spencer committed the mistake himself, for which he censures me unjustly. "Mr. Spencer has read into some of Kant's expressions meanings which they do not rightly bear."

#### IV.

But Mr. Spencer adduces a fact, which, if it were as Mr. Spencer represents it, would show an inability on my part of making important distinctions. He says of me:

"He blames the English for mistranslating Kant, since they have said 'Kant maintained that Space and Time are intuitions,' which is quite untrue, for they have everywhere described him as maintaining that Space and Time are *forms* of intuition."

This is a double mistake: (1) Kant and his translators did not make the distinction of which Mr. Spencer speaks, and (2) the quotation Mr. Spencer makes from my article is represented to mean something different from what it actually means in the context.

Before I speak for myself as to what I actually said, let us state the facts concerning Kant's usage of the terms "intuitions" and "forms of intuition."

Kant defines in § 1 of his "Critique of Pure Reason" what he understands by "Transcendental Æsthetic." He distinguishes between "empirical intuition" (*empirische Anschauung*) and "pure intuition" (*reine Anschauung*). He says:

"That sort of intuition which relates to an object by means of sensation, is called an empirical intuition."



Representations contain besides that which belongs to sensation some other elements. Kant says :

“That which effects that the content of the phenomenon can be arranged under certain relations, I call its *form*.”

And later on he continues :

“This pure form of sensibility I shall call pure intuition.”

These are Kant's phrases in J. M. D. Meiklejohn's well known translation. The term “pure intuition” is repeated again and again, and we find frequently added by way of explanation the phrases “as a mere form of sensibility,” “the mere form of phenomena,” “forms of sensuous intuition,” and also (as Mr. Spencer emphasises as the only correct way) “forms of intuition.”

Kant says :

1) “*Diese reine Form der Sinnlichkeit wird auch selber reine Anschauung heissen.* § 1.

2) “*Zweitens werden wir von dieser (der empirischen Anschauung) noch alles abtrennen, damit nichts als reine Anschauung und die blosse Form der Erscheinungen übrig bleibe.* § 1.

3) “*Raum . . . muss ursprünglich Anschauung sein.* § 3.

4) “*Der Raum ist nichts anderes als nur die Form aller Erscheinungen äusserer Sinne.* § 3.

5) “*Der Raum aber betrifft nur die reine Form der Anschauung.* (This passage appears in the first edition only, the paragraph containing it is omitted in the second edition.) § 3.

6) “*Die Zeit ist . . . eine reine Form der sinnlichen Anschauung.* . . . § 4.

7) “*Es muss ihr\* unmittelbare Anschauung zum Grunde liegen.* § 4.

8) “*Die Zeit ist nichts anderes als die Form des inneren Sinnes.* § 6.

9) “*. . . dass die Vorstellung der Zeit selbst Anschauung sei.* § 6.

10) “*Wir haben nun . . . reine Anschauung a priori, Raum und Zeit.* § 10. *Beschluss der transcendentalen Ästhetik.*”

These quotations do not pretend to be exhaustive, nor is that necessary for the present purpose.

Kant, as we learn from these quotations, makes no distinction between *reine Anschauung* and *Form der Anschauung*. He uses most frequently the term *reine Anschauung* and designates in several places

---

\* Second edition reads “*ihnen*” in place of “*ihr*,” viz. *der Zeit*.. The word “*ihnen*” refers to *Theilvorstellungen der Zeit*.

Space and Time simply as *Anschauung*. (See the quotations 3, 7, and 9.) So far as I can gather from a renewed perusal, the expression proposed by Mr. Spencer, "form of intuition," *Form der Anschauung*, occurs only once and that too in a passage omitted in the second edition.

It is almost redundant to add that the English translators and interpreters of Kant follow the original pretty closely. Accordingly it is actually incorrect "that they have everywhere (!) described Kant as maintaining that Space and Time are *forms* of intuition." In addition to the quotations from Meiklejohn, I call Mr. Spencer's attention to William Flemming's "Vocabulary of Philosophy" (4th ed., edited by Henry Calderwood) which reads *sub voce* "Intuition," p. 228 with reference to Kant's view :

"Space and time are *intuitions* of sense."

To say "Time and Space are forms of intuition" is quite correct according to Kantian terminology. No objection can be made to Mr. Spencer on that ground. But to say "Time and Space are intuitions" is also quite correct, and Mr. Spencer is wrong in censuring the expression.

Why does Mr. Spencer rebuke me so severely on a point which is of no consequence? He appears confident that I have betrayed an unpardonable misconception of Kant's philosophy. But having pointed out by quotations from Kant that this is not so, I shall now proceed to explain why the quotation which Mr. Spencer makes from my article, although the eight words in quotation marks are literally quoted, is a misquotation. It is torn out of its context. I did not blame the English translators of Kant at all, but I blamed his interpreters, among whom the English interpreters (not all English interpreters, but certainly some of them) are the worst, for "mutilating Kant's best thoughts, so that this hero of progress appears as a stronghold of antiquated views"; and as an instance I called attention to the misconception of Kant's term *Anschauung*, saying :

"How different is Kant's philosophy, for instance, if his position with reference to time and space is mistaken! 'Time and Space are our *Anschauung*,' Kant says. But his English translators declare 'Kant maintained that space and time are in-

tuitions.' What a difference it makes if intuition is interpreted in the sense applied to it by the English intuitionist school instead of its being taken in the original meaning of the word *Anschauung*."

The word "intuition" implies something mysterious; the word *Anschauung* denotes that which is immediately perceived, simply, as it were, by looking at it. So especially the sense-perceptions of the things before us are *Anschauungen*.

Mr. Spencer, believing that he had caught me in making un-awares a blunder, tears the passage out of its context, ignores its purport, makes a point of an antithesis which had nothing in the world to do with the topic under discussion, only to throw on me the opprobrium of incompetence. Even if Mr. Spencer's antithesis of "intuition" and "forms of intuition" were of any consequence (as, unfortunately for Mr. Spencer, it is not), it would count for nothing against me because I did not speak of "forms" in the passage referred to, I simply alluded to one misinterpretation of the term *Anschauung*, which is quite common among English Kantians. It was not required by the purpose I had in view, to enter into any details as to what kind of *Anschauung* I meant, and an allusion to "form" or to any other subject would have served only to confound the idea which I intended to set forth in the paragraph from which Mr. Spencer quotes.

Misquotation of this kind, into which Mr. Spencer was inveigled by a hasty reading, should be avoided with utmost care, for it involves an insinuation. It leads away from the main point under discussion to side issues, and it misrepresents the author from whom the quotation is made. It insinuates a meaning which the passage does not bear and which was not even thought of in the context out of which it is torn.

Mr. Spencer quotes the passage as if I had preferred the term "intuition" to the term "form of intuition," or at least, as if I had no idea that Kant conceives Time and Space as "forms." Yet Mr. Spencer in trying to make out a point against me betrays his own lack of information. Kant insisted most emphatically on calling the forms of our sensibility (i. e. space and time) "*Anschauungen*."

But Mr. Spencer's case is worse still. While he insists upon the statement that according to the translators of Kant space and time are "forms of intuition," which is at least correct, he uses twice in the very same paragraph the expression that according to Kant "space and time are forms of thought," which is incorrect. The forms of thought according to Kantian terminology are not space and time but the domain of the transcendental logic. Anyone who confounds the two terms "forms of intuition" and "forms of thought" proves himself unable to form a correct opinion on Kant's philosophy. That is just characteristic of Kant that he regards time and space not as thought, nor as forms of thought, but as *Anschauungen* and in contradistinction to sense-intuitions (i. e. sensations) he calls them *reine Anschauungen* or *Formen der Anschauung*.

## v.

Mr. Spencer commenting upon his criticism of Kant's idea of a Good Will, says :

"I find that in the above three paragraphs I have done Kant less than justice and more than justice—less, in assuming that his evolutionary view was limited to the genesis of our sidereal system, and more, in assuming that he had not contradicted himself.

"Clearly, I am indebted to Dr. Carus for enabling me to prove that Kant's defence of his theory of 'a good will' is, by his own showing, baseless."

Kant's idea of a good will has nothing to do with evolution, and we can abstain here from discussing whether or not Kant was an evolutionist. Whether evolution is true or not, what difference does it make to the proposition, that a good will is the only thing which can be called good without further qualification (*ohne Einschränkung*)? Pleasure is good, but it is not absolutely good, there are cases in which pleasure is a very bad thing. We must qualify our statement and limit it to special cases. A good will, however, says Kant, is in itself good under all circumstances.

Did Mr. Spencer prove the baselessness of Kant's proposition by proving evolution? Is it inconsistent to believe in evolution and at the same time to regard a good will as absolutely good, as good without reserve or limitation? I think not!

## VI.

Mr. Spencer in admitting that "the general drift of the passages quoted makes it tolerably clear that Kant must have believed in the operation of natural causes . . . in producing organic forms," adds :

"He does not, however, extend the theory of natural genesis to the exclusion of the theory of supernatural genesis."

How does Mr. Spencer prove his statement? Does he quote a passage from Kant which expresses his belief in supernaturalism? No, Mr. Spencer does not quote Kant, and it would be difficult to find a passage to suit that purpose. Mr. Spencer adduces a few unmeaning phrases gleaned at random and torn out of their context, and from these phrases he concludes that Kant believed in the supernatural. Kant spoke somewhere of "the wisdom of nature" who has things so arranged that the species might be preserved. If the wisdom of nature in preserving the species is to be taken literally, the phrase might prove that Kant believed nature to be a wise old woman. Kant spoke further of "the germ of reason placed in man whereby he is destined to social intercourse." Does the usage of the word "destined" really "imply divine intervention," as Mr. Spencer says? Mr. Spencer adds :

"And this [viz. Kant's usage of these phrases] shows that I was justified in ascribing to him the belief that Space and Time, as forms of thought [sic!], are supernatural endowments."

What might we not prove by this kind of loose argumentation !

Kant did not introduce any supernatural explanations ; on the contrary, he proposed to exclude "supernatural genesis." He says e. g. in a passage of the "Critique of Judgment" quoted on page 41 of the appendix :

"If we assume occasionalism for the production of organised beings, nature is thereby wholly discarded . . . therefore it cannot be supposed that this system is accepted by anyone who has had to do with philosophy."

And furthermore Kant rejects the partial admission of the supernatural, saying :

"As though it were not the same to make the required forms arise in a supernatural manner at the beginning of the world as during its progress."

Mr. Spencer charges Kant with inconsistency. We do not intend to say that Kant was in all the phases of his development consistent with himself. But we do say that the charge of Mr. Spencer against Kant consists in this : the real Kant has said things which are incompatible with Mr. Spencer's view of Kant.

This settles the sixth point.

#### VII.

Mr. Spencer's reply to my criticism is a very strange piece of controversy and I have actually been at a loss, how to account for it.

The situation can be explained only by assuming that Mr. Spencer, being an impatient reader, when finding out that he disagreed with my propositions, could go no further and wrote his reply to me without having read my articles. This is very hard on a critic who, carefully avoiding everything that might look like fault-finding, is painstakingly careful in giving to the author criticised every means of investigating the truth himself and helps him in a friendly way to correct his errors.

There is only one consolation for me, which is, that I am in good company. The great thinker of Koenigsberg is very severely censured in almost all of Mr. Spencer's writings for ideas which he never held. And now Mr. Spencer confesses openly and with ingenuous sincerity, that his knowledge of Kant's writings is extremely limited. But why he condemns a man of whom he knows so little Mr. Spencer does not tell us.

Mr. Spencer says :

"My knowledge of Kant's writings is extremely limited. In 1844 a translation of his "Critique of Pure Reason" (then I think lately published) fell into my hands, and I read the first few pages enunciating his doctrine of Time and Space : my peremptory rejection of which caused me to lay the book down.

"Twice since then the same thing has happened ; for, being an impatient reader, when I disagree with the cardinal propositions of a work I can go no further.

"One other thing I knew. By indirect references I was made aware that Kant had propounded the idea that celestial bodies have been formed by the aggregation of diffused matter. Beyond this my knowledge of his conceptions did not extend ; and my supposition that his evolutionary conception had stopped short with the genesis of sun, stars, and planets was due to the fact that his doctrine of Time and

Space, as forms of thought [sic] anteceding experience, implied a supernatural origin inconsistent with the hypothesis of natural genesis."

Kant has been a leader in thought for the last century. It is very important to criticise his ideas wherever they are wrong, but his errors cannot be conquered by *ex cathedra* denunciations.

Darwin's habits in investigating and weighing the pro and con of a question were very different from Mr. Spencer's, and Darwin's success is in no small degree due to the sternness with which he adhered to certain rules of reading and studying. We find in his "Autobiography" certain reminiscences labeled "important" from which the following is most instructive :

"I had also, during many years, followed a golden rule, namely, that whenever a published fact, a new observation or a thought, came across me, which was opposed to my general results, to make a memorandum of it without fail, for I had found by experience that such facts and thoughts were far more apt to escape from the memory than favorable ones."

Experience teaches that we can learn most from those authors with whom we do not agree. The ethics of reading and studying demand other habits than laying a book down when we disagree with its cardinal propositions. Such habits prevent progress and create prejudices.

\* \* \*

Mr. Spencer has not answered my criticism at all. Mr. Spencer did not even take into consideration the passages quoted from Kant. He republished all the false statements of Kant's views, so inconsiderately made, together with all the perverse opinions based upon them. The assurance with which Mr. Spencer makes statements which have no foundation whatever is really perplexing even to a man who is well informed on the subject, and it will go far to convince the unwary reader. What, however, shall become of the general tenor of philosophical criticism and controversy if a man of Mr. Spencer's reputation is so indifferent about being informed concerning the exact views of his adversary, if he is so careless in presenting them, if he makes positively erroneous statements on confessedly mere "supposition," and finally, if in consequence thereof

he is flagrantly unjust in censuring errors which arise only from his own too prolific imagination?

We feel confident that Mr. Spencer will explain his side of the question satisfactorily. His mistakes being undeniable, we do not believe that he will seek to deny them. Yet we trust that Mr. Spencer as soon as he finds himself at fault, will not even make an attempt at palliation, that he will not blink the frank acknowledgment of his misstatements and also of having treated Kant with injustice. A man who has devoted his life to the search for truth will not suffer any blot to remain on his escutcheon.

EDITOR.